REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-4, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara et al. (US 6,329,980) in view of Furuhashi et al. (US 6,556,180).

Claims 5-7, 10, 11, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara et al. in view of Furuhashi et al. and Kuga (US 5,828,367).

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara et al. in view of Furuhashi et al., Kuga, and Kasahara et al. (US 6,414,657).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 8, 10, and 14 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-4, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara et al. (US 6,329,980) in view of Furuhashi et al. (US 6,556,180), claims 5-7, 10, 11, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara et al. in view of Furuhashi et al. and Kuga (US 5,828,367), claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara et al. in view of Furuhashi et al., Kuga, and Kasahara et al. (US 6,414,657). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon combinations of prior art references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claims 1, 5, 8, and 10, and hence dependent claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, and 11-14.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a color-correction method for a liquid crystal display including, in part, steps of "increasing the data voltage of a current frame if the data voltage of the current frame is greater than the data voltage of the previous frame," "decreasing the data voltage of the current frame if the data voltage of the current frame is smaller than ~~that~~ the data voltage of the previous frame," and "decreasing the data voltage of the current frame with a predetermined value if the data voltage of the current frame is equal to the data voltage of the previous frame." Similarly, independent claim 5, as amended, recites a color-correction method for a liquid crystal display including, in part, steps of "decreasing the data voltage of the current frame if the data voltage of the current frame is equal to of the previous frame," and "increasing the increased data voltage of the current frame if the data voltage of the current frame is greater than the data voltage of the previous frame, and decreasing the decreased data voltage of the current frame if the data voltage of the current frame is smaller than the data voltage of the previous frame."

Independent claim 8, as amended, recites a color-correction apparatus including, in part, "a data modulator modulating the data from the frame memory using a look-up table having modulation information for increasing a data voltage of a current frame if the data voltage of the current frame is greater than a data voltage of a previous frame, decreasing the data voltage of the current frame if the data voltage of the current frame is smaller than the data voltage of the previous frame, and decreasing the data voltage of the current frame with a predetermined value if the data voltage of the current frame is equal to the data voltage of the previous frame." Similarly, independent claim 10, as

amended, recites a color-correction apparatus including, in part, "a first data modulator more

increasing a voltage level of the input data when the voltage is more increased at the current frame than at

the previous frame and more decreasing the voltage level when the voltage level is more reduced at the

current frame than at the previous frame," and "a second data modulator decreasing the voltage with a

predetermined voltage value when the voltage of the current frame is equal to the voltage of the previous

frame."

The Office Action alleges that Uehara et al. teaches a color LCD display apparatus for

"increasing a data voltage of a current frame if the data voltage of the current period is greater

than the previous period, and decreasing the data voltage of the current frame if the data voltage

of the current period is less than the previous period (see figures 1, 4-6, 14; column 1, lines 49-

51 and column 9, lines 6-60)." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Uehara et al. discloses (col. 9, lines 35-44, and FIG. 6) that if a difference between

previous and subsequent amplitudes is small, then an amplitude of a correction signal (6-d in

FIG. 6) is greatly decreased and added to an original pixel signal (6-e in FIG. 6). Conversely, if

the difference is large, then the amplitude of the correction signal (6-d) is slightly decreased and

added to the original pixel signal (6-e). Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Uehara et al.

teaches always increasing the original pixel signal by the correction signal regardless of the

difference between previous and subsequent amplitudes.

In contrast to Uehara et al., independent claims 1 and 8, as amended, both recite, in part,

"decreasing the data voltage of the current frame if the data voltage of the current frame is

smaller than the data voltage of the previous frame." Similarly, independent claim 5, as amended, recites, in part, "decreasing the data voltage of the current frame if the data voltage of the current frame is equal to the data voltage of the previous frame." Likewise, independent claim 10, as amended, recites, in part, "more decreasing the voltage level when the voltage level is more reduced at the current frame than at the previous frame." Applicants respectfully assert that Uehara et al. is completely silent with regard to varying the data voltages of a current frame based upon voltage values of previous frames. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Uehara et al. fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 5, 8 and 10.

In further contrast to Uehara et al., independent claims 1 and 8, as amended, both recited, in part, "decreasing the data voltage of the current frame with a predetermined value if the data voltage of the current frame is equal to the data voltage of the previous frame." Applicants respectfully assert that Uehara et al. is completely silent with regard to varying the data voltages of a current frame based upon equal voltage values of previous frames. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Uehara et al. fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1 and 8.

Applicant further respectfully asserts that the Office Action does not rely on any of Furuhashi et al., Kuga, and/or Kasahara et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Uehara et al. Moreover, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of Furuhashi et al., Kuga, and/or Kasahara et al. can remedy the deficiencies of Uehara et al.

Since the Office Action fails to meet the requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to independent claims 1, 5, 8 and 10, claims 1, 5, 8, and 10 are not obvious,

and hence dependent claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, and 11-14 are not obvious. Thus, Applicant respectfully

requests that the rejections of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely

allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues

outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's

undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge

the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should

also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: January 7, 2005

Customer Number: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
202-739-3000